

REMARKS

The comments of the applicant below are each preceded by related comments of the examiner (in small, bold type).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351 (a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claim 49 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sieber (US 6,799,547 B2). As disclosed at column 7, lines 35-67, cylinder No. 1 and cylinder No. 3 are selected and fired so as to cause reverse rotation, which is "independently of the normal operating stroke cycles" to the extent required by claim 48, given the broadest reasonable interpretation pursuant to MPEP §§ 2111 and 2111.01. Because forward and reverse starting are alternatively claimed, only one is required for anticipation.

The rejection could be overcome by amending the last two lines of claim 49 to read "wherein the starting module is configured to start the engine selectively in either forward or reverse".

The applicant has amended claim 49 as suggested by the Examiner.

Canceled claims, if any, have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Any circumstance in which the applicant has (a) addressed certain comments of the examiner does not mean that the applicant concedes other comments of the examiner, (b) made arguments for the patentability of some claims does not mean that there are not other good reasons for patentability of those claims and other claims, or (c) amended or canceled a claim does not mean that the applicant concedes any of the examiner's positions with respect to that claim or other claims.

Applicant : David E. Hanson et al.
Serial No. : 10/810,930
Filed : March 26, 2004
Page : 8 of 8

Attorney's Docket No.: 02103-452001 / AABOSS63

Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050, Order No. 02103-452001.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 3/17/04



David L. Feigenbaum
Reg. No. 30,378

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906

21288574.doc